

1.941  
R4I16  
Reserve

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
U.S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics and  
Farm Security Administration Cooperating

# ILL FED, ILL CLOTHED, ILL HOUSED -- FIVE HUNDRED FAMILIES IN NEED OF HELP

LIBRARY  
RECEIVED  
★ JUL 7 1942 ★  
U. S. Department of Agriculture

By

RACHEL ROWE SWIGER,  
Junior Social Science Analyst,  
Farm Security Administration

and

CONRAD TAEUBER,  
Senior Social Scientist,  
Bureau of Agricultural Economics

BELLA SHACHTMAN  
LIBRARY  
U S DEPT OF AGRIC  
BUREAU OF AGRIC  
WASHINGTON D C

Washington, D. C.  
April 1942

USDA  
LIB

## Contents

	Page
Preliminary observations.....	1
Economic status.....	6
Housing.....	10
Household equipment and conveniences.....	12
Self-sufficiency.....	14
Health conditions.....	16
Community and organizational participation.....	17
Appendixes	
A. Project areas, by counties.....	19
B. Schedules and instructions.....	20
C. Tables.....	29



ILL FED, ILL CLOTHED, ILL HOUSED—  
FIVE HUNDRED FAMILIES IN NEED OF HELP

By  
Rachel Rowe Swiger  
and  
Conrad Taeuber

Preliminary Observations

A large percentage of the farm families of the United States do not have comfortable living standards or any semblance of economic security. They raise very little, either for sale or for their own use, and earnings from other employment are generally meager. Although they are nominally dependent on agriculture, these families are poorly fed and housed. Increased farm prices effect them very little. Many are operating on such a low economic level that they are not eligible for existing rehabilitation programs. Neither regular nor emergency agricultural agencies have been able to carry their services to this group as extensively as to other farm families.

DEC 28 1942

In 1938, a committee, made up of representatives from various branches of the Department of Agriculture, was appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to study the problems of this low-income group and to recommend practical corrective measures. After deliberation the committee decided that the most practical approach to the problems would be through an experimental program with a group of such farm families, carefully selecting a number of sample counties to represent the more important types of situations, so that experience could be developed from which a modified or more complete program could be instituted.

The program was to be carried on with the assistance of legal Farm Security Administration personnel in 11 counties scattered over the Country where economic pressure among farm families was believed to be most severe. Within each county a smaller area was outlined, and all families within that area in need of help and willing to cooperate were to be eligible for assistance unless they were mentally or physically unable to carry out a farm program. Full-time farm and home-management supervisors were assigned to each area to provide intensive supervision. It was their task to help needy farm families unable to qualify for the regular Standard-Loan program toward self-support. The cooperation of all local agencies that could in any way aid in the rehabilitation of these families was to be enlisted; wide discretion as to use of grants and loans was to be provided to meet the individual needs of the families; and case loads were to be limited to approximately 50 families to insure time for adequate individual and group supervision.

Certain information collected as a part of case records at the time these families were accepted for the program, not only helped the supervisors to interpret more accurately the needs of each family and the best method of approach in planning for its rehabilitation; it provides also a description of the general condition and characteristics of the families, at or before the time they were accepted for the program and may be utilized as a base for measuring changes in practices or levels of living occurring during the process



of rehabilitation. These are the same families which were described in the report, "Five Hundred Families Rehabilitate Themselves," published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Farm Security Administration in February 1941. Problems plaguing most of these families at the time they came into the program were of long standing and were caused by a combination of forces consisting of social, economic, and personality liabilities as well as physical and psychological illnesses. In general, they were a poverty-stricken group living after a hand-to-mouth fashion, without sufficient personal security to enable them to proceed without outside help. A realistic portrayal of the struggles and deprivations experienced by these families is revealed in excerpts taken from case histories:

"Mr. and Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_ have been married 11 years and have moved eight times. The first 3 years of their married life they sharecropped, receiving no cash income. They then gave up sharecropping and worked for wages on a farm. He was paid \$8 per month for 8 months and then had to pick up work where he could find it the rest of the year. This, he found, was even more difficult than sharecropping so he decided to try something else. He promised to pay \$40 for a mule and tried cash renting. This, too, was a failure and he was forced to give up the mule and go back to sharecropping. At the time the cash crop is sold, he always owes the landlord about the amount his crop brings. He must then hunt day work to buy food for his undernourished family."

"None of the 10 members of this family has been further than the third grade in school. The father has a second grade education but cannot write his name. The mother completed three grades but can do no more than write her name. The 14-year-old son has a third grade education while the 10 and 11-year old girls have only completed the first and second grades. The wife's health is very poor. Due to the lack of sufficient funds to secure the services of a doctor, a mid-wife was used at the birth of 7 of the 8 children. This family has worked for wages and sharecropped all the while. All attention has been given to a cash crop which failed to produce more than enough to pay the annual run-bill assumed by the landlord during the making of crops. Therefore, no money was available to buy clothes for the children to wear to school or to add to the home furnishings."

"Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ never went to school a day in his life; but Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_ has a fifth grade education. Although the 16-year-old girl has completed 3 grades, none of the others (6-14 years) have ever gone beyond the second grade. The children are not in school now as they do not have sufficient clothing. Some do not even have shoes at present. The 13 people live in a small 4-room house with wooden shutters. When Mr. and Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_ were first married they owned a plug mule and cash rented but never cleared any money. After making 3 crops the mule died and they had to start sharecropping. As their food crop was neglected, it always took all they made, including corn, feed crops and



most of the time their meat hogs to pay their run-bill. This family uses 1 bushel of meal each week. They have to eat corn bread for breakfast quite a bit. About 2 weeks ago they killed 4 hogs and now have only 8 pounds of lard and about 100 pounds of meat left which with the exception of 20 gallons of syrup is all the food they have on hand. They have never grown a fall garden nor owned a milk cow."

"This family cultivated 50 acres of cotton this year, making only 7 bales. Their entire time was devoted to the cotton - not even a garden was planted. He lacked \$75 paying his 1938 run-bill. He says he has gone hungry many a day but still continued the practice of devoting all of his work to a cash crop and neglecting his food crop altogether."

"This family of nine lives in a two-room box type house. The walls have not been ceiled and there are no window screens, doors, storage space, or toilet."

"This family of six lives in a one-room house built of rough lumber with no inside wall covering. Cupboards for storage of clothing have been made from boxes which are attached to the wall."

"This family of eight has one mattress - rugs and straw ticks are used for beds."

"A mother gravely concerned over marked signs of malnutrition among her children patehtically asked 'I think they'll get all right when we get plenty of milk don't you?' The children had gone without milk for 18 months."

"The entire family is subject to a lot of sickness. The mother has pellagra and the children are all undernourished."

The following quotation is included not because it is a typical case but rather to illustrate the devastating effects of poverty on the moral and emotional stability of a once respected and much better adjusted family and to point out more clearly and strongly the need of a particularly well-chosen personnel to handle and deal with such an individualistic and cross-section group of people:

"He is a man who at one time was worth \$70,000 but due to extending too much credit in a dry goods business it is reported, went bankrupt and for the past 8 or 10 years has been on relief. He now has nothing on which to live and nothing with which to operate his farm, not even an axe or saw with which to cut timber or enough cash to buy a 50-cent hammer with which to set a saw. He is a man who has taught school, speaks precise English, is proud of the fact that his children do not miss a day from school, used a compass and protractor to draw a map of his farm to perfect scale, owns an expensive violin, appreciates it and knows how to play it, yet has been sued by his



crippled daughter for incest, uses his imbecile son as a horse to haul mine props, keeps poultry in the same room in which the family sleeps and in 3 years has not taken the trouble to put a brush screen around the place which his family uses for a toilet."

### Residences

These are not poverty-stricken urban families who have recently moved to the country, but the majority of the heads of these households have lived in the same county for 20 years or more. In Beltrami County, Minn. and Thurston County, Wash., where stability of residence was least, the average was 14 and 10 years respectively. For the entire group three-fourths had been in the same county 20 years or longer. Only about one-sixth had been in the same county less than 10 years.

### Farm Experience

Not only have the heads of these families been living in the same county, but most of their experience has been in farming. The average was 19 years of farming experience with nearly one-half having farmed 20 years or more. The mean average of 8 years occurred in Grundy County, Mo., and the highest, 26 years, in Mercer County, W. Va.

### Age of farm operators and homemakers

If a person could visit all of these families he would be impressed with the relative youth of the family heads. Most of these were men under 45 with 3 to 9 children. In all counties the average age of the homemakers was 6 years younger than that of the operators.

### Education of operators and homemakers

The average number of grades completed by the operators was 5.5; by homemakers, 6.2. According to case histories, a number of those who were reported as having completed from 2 to 3 grades could do little more than write their names and in some instances they could not do that.

The homemakers completed an average of almost one grade more than the operators. Twenty-five percent of those in Beltrami County, Minn. and Grundy County, Mo., and 44 percent of those in Thurston County, Wash. were reported as having completed high school. The percentage attaining this record in other counties was considerably lower.

That the children of many of these poverty-stricken families were growing up no better equipped educationally than their parents is indicated by case narratives such as: "The father has only a first grade education while the mother has completed the third grade. The

16-year-old son had completed the first grade but was unable to write his name legibly. The 16-year-old girl had finished 3 grades, the 10-year-old boy one grade, but the 7-year-old girl was still in the primer. Since the father only earned 65 cents a day, which was used to purchase food, the children had not had sufficient clothes and shoes to wear to school. This, along with frequent colds and other illnesses, had made their attendance very irregular."

#### Size of family

The average number of persons per family among the project borrowers was 5.3. More than one-third of all families had from 6 to 9 members. Families in Grundy and Thurston Counties had approximately 2 members less than those in other counties.

More than three-fourths of all the children were under 16 years of age and only one-eighth were boys over 16 years old.



### Economic Status

These families lacked sufficient cropland, livestock, machinery, and equipment with which to eke out more than a bare subsistence and they had little opportunity for nonfarm employment with which to supplement the meager farm income. They lacked security of tenure - the renters and sharecroppers were continually moving in search of something better and the owners were almost invariably faced with mortgages and delinquent taxes, too burdensome to cope with, or they found that they were no longer able to keep up their land payments. Most of this land was not cleared and was being bought on a contract basis.

### Tenure

Slightly more than half of all the project borrowers were either full or part owners. Most families in Beltrami County were buying farms on a contract basis. This was also true of about 17 percent of those in Thurston County.

It is significant that the percentage of ownership is highest on cut-over forest lands in Beltrami and Thurston Counties where land available for crops was less than in other counties.

Tenancy was predominant in Laurens and Oglethorpe Counties in Georgia and in Grundy County, Mo., where from 88 to 100 percent of the families were renters. The project families had previously been accustomed to obtaining only verbal yearly rental agreements. Failure to obtain long-term written leases and better rental terms had resulted in their frequent moving. Many offered this as a reason for not having made improvements in their yard and garden fences. A number stated that landlords would not permit the cultivation of gardens as they were afraid time would be lost from cash crops. Much of the restlessness and lack of pride in home surroundings, as well as the economic condition of these families, may be attributed to poor tenancy policies.

### Size of farm

Many of the farm units would not be large enough to support the average size family even if the land were good and scientific methods were employed. The average farm contained 73 acres. This does not mean much as the type of farming land, fertility and area of land available for crops varied considerably in the different counties. An acreage sufficient in one county where one type of farming is practiced might be insufficient in some other county where another type of farming is followed. Oglethorpe County, with an average of 119 acres per cotton farm, would certainly seem adequate but this is altered by the fact that the land was submarginal



and only 23 percent of the total acreage was available for crops. Only about one-fourth of the land for the entire group was classified as tillable. The insufficiency of cropland was more pronounced in Beltrami County where several of the farms had less than 10 acres available for crops.

### Livestock

Livestock was universally of the "scrub" type. Not a single family reported any animals that were purebred or registered stock. Adequate provisions and facilities for the proper care of livestock, such as inoculation and shelter, were rarely seen.

Almost half of the families and in several counties more than three-fourths, were without milk cows. It had been a general experience that those who did not have cows seldom, if ever, had milk. This is particularly significant in view of the fact that these families had an average of 3.3 children and in many cases from 6 to 9. Many large families who had only one cow did not obtain a sufficient year-round supply to provide adequately for their needs.

Families without other livestock ranged from more than one-third without hogs to more than three-fourths without sheep. The average number of chickens per family was only 27 and nearly one-fourth of all the families had none.

### Assets

More than one-half or 59 percent of the total assets for this group of families, was distributed in land and land improvements; only 6 percent was in machinery, and 17 percent in livestock. The total average value of assets per family was \$897, but omitting the value of land and improvements, the average was only \$368 per family. The county averages varied from \$99 in Laurens County to \$719 in Beltrami County. Nearly half of the families in the Georgia counties had assets with an average valuation of less than \$100. That these were over-all figures, which included food on hand and even the most minor household articles of little or no value, is illustrated by a representative quotation from a Laurens County case history as follows: "His total assets, valued at \$20, consist of 1 cultivator (\$4), 6 hens, 3 very poor beds, 1 chair, 1 table, 1 very small stove, 3 sheets, 6 quilts, 6 plates, 2 cups, 2 saucers, 3 knives, and 6 forks. He has absolutely no food on hand, not even a bushel of potatoes."

### Farm encumbrances

Slightly more than nine-tenths of the owners and three-fourths of the renters reported farm indebtedness. The average encumbrance for the owners was \$427, for the renters, \$38. The average farm debt



for all operators was \$233. When taxes and real estate mortgages are excluded, the average indebtedness for all families (renters and owners) is reduced to \$99 per family with a range of from \$24 in Oglethorpe County to \$414 in Thurston County. Nearly one-half of the families owed less than \$50. Families with least liabilities usually were those whose assets were also least. For example in the case related under the topic of assets, this client's total assets, consisting chiefly of household goods, of perhaps no salable value, was valued at \$20 while his liabilities amounted to \$75.

The percentage of the total indebtedness attributed to medical services was considerably higher in the Georgia and Missouri counties, where the range was from 11 to 32 percent, than in all the other counties, with a range of from 1 to 9 percent.

#### Net worth and net equity in land

More than one-third of all the families showed a net asset of less than \$200. The average for all counties was \$663, with a range of from \$72 in Laurens County to \$1,264 in Thurston County. Much of the variation occurring in the different counties may be attributed to land ownership. When considered on the basis of net worth minus net equity in land, the average for the entire group was reduced to \$271, with a range of from \$72 in Laurens County to \$269 in Thurston County.

#### Income

The average total cash income for families in all counties the year previous to coming on the program was \$329, many families having considerably less. This was especially true in Oglethorpe County where more than half of the families had a cash income of less than \$100.

Slightly more than one-third of the total cash income was derived from the farm. The average farm income for the entire group was \$117. More than one-half of this amount was derived from the sale of livestock and livestock products, which was the chief source of farm income in all counties except Laurens and Oglethorpe, where more than 90 percent of the agricultural income was derived from crop sales.

It is significant that counties in which the average income was highest were the ones in which farmers received the highest percentage of their total cash income from a nonagricultural source.

Approximately 80 percent of all families had some nonfarm work. The average number of days per family reporting was 121. Slightly more than one-half of the families had less than 125 days. This figure varied considerably in the different counties, particularly in Laurens County where one-half of the families had less than 25 days.



The average annual earnings from nonfarm work per family was \$242. However, slightly more than half of the families received less than \$200. The average daily wage was \$1.98. The range in the average daily wage ran from as low as \$0.75 in Laurens County to \$2.85 in Beltrami County. Many of the day laborers in the Georgia counties had as little as \$0.25 to 0.35 per day.

Nearly one-half of the families received relief, in some form, the year previous to becoming project borrowers. The average amount received per family reporting was \$128. More than three-fourths of the total amount of relief dispersed was derived from W.P.A. work. Some of the families, it was reported, sold their livestock and meager equipment in an effort to obtain W.P.A. work which it was felt provided more security than the income from their farms. Approximately one-third of the nonfarm income was derived from this source.

The major portion of the nonagricultural income was derived from such sources as road work, hauling, driving school busses, and miscellaneous day labor, as well as money obtained from Old Age Assistance, work compensation, pensions, and contributions from relatives.

#### Expenditures

The average total cash expenditure for all the families was \$336, with an average range of from \$111 in Oglethorpe County to \$593 in Beltrami County. More than one-half of the total expenditures was expended on family operations such as food, clothing, medical care, household furnishings, etc. In cases where families failed to produce home foods all of the cash income was spent for family living. Very little money was available or spent for farm improvement or upkeep.



## Housing

Approximately one-half of all the houses were too small to comfortably accommodate the families that occupied them. Families of five and six members were sometimes forced to sleep in the same room regardless of age or sex. Houses that were fairly adequate in size were as a rule old and dilapidated, most of them being poorly ventilated, either from lack of windows or from having no panes and screens, which necessitated closing to keep out the cold in winter and flies and mosquitoes in summer. The houses were usually poorly built, without inside finished walls or ceiling, and were often cold and drafty. Very few had closet facilities, families usually hung their clothes on nails around the walls or behind beds and doors. The almost universal lack of adequate storage space for food not only resulted in freezing loss which robbed families of food they had worked hard to preserve and for which they were in dire need, but also already overcrowded houses were made more unattractive by the necessity of sticking cans and boxes of food under beds, tables, and in corners of rooms.

### Kinds of houses

More than three-fourths of all houses were of frame construction and only one-fifth of these were painted. Log houses constituted one-fourth of the dwellings in Knox and Beltrami Counties; a minor portion of those in Beltrami County were covered with tar paper. All houses in the San Miguel County area were built adobe style.

### Age of houses

The houses ranged in age from less than 1 year to over 75 years, the average age being 27 years, whereas more than one-third were from 25 to 50 years old. The oldest houses were more frequently found in Oglethorpe, Grundy, and San Miguel Counties.

### Condition of houses

A classification of the various structural parts of the house into good, fair, and poor condition was used as a means to measure the general conditions of housing. Parts taken into consideration were the roofs, floors, walls, foundations, screens, and steps. Slightly more than one-fourth of the houses were classified as good on all six items. "Fair" was the most popular classification on all items except screens. One-half of the dwellings had no screens and only one-fourth were rated as having screens in good condition. In Oglethorpe County only 10 percent of the houses were screened. Other items having the highest "poor" rating were steps and roofs.



## Size and adequacy of houses

If it is assumed that one room per person represents about the correct requirement for average houses and average families, these families were badly overcrowded. The average number of rooms per house, occupied by the project families was 3.6, while the average size of family was 5.3. Thus, slightly more than half a room was available per person. Many families had much less space for living quarters. This was especially true in Beltrami and Reynolds Counties where from more than one-fourth to more than one-third of the families, with an average of over five members, lived in two-room houses, and in San Miguel County where three-fourths of the families lived in three-room dwellings. Houses with three and four rooms were the most common.

The average number of bedrooms per family was 1.9 with an average of 2.7 persons per sleeping room.

The relation of number of occupants to number of bedrooms was measured by two standards: (1) three-fifths of a bedroom per person and (2) specific measurement for individual families, (a) not more than two adults per room, (b) one adult with not more than two children of the same sex per room, (c) not more than four children per room, (d) male and female children over 6 years old placed in separate rooms, (e) one child under 6 years old permitted to share room with not more than two female children. When measured by the first standard (1), nearly two-thirds of the families had inadequate sleeping space, and, according to the latter standard (2), nearly one-half of the families were in need of additional sleeping space.

A shortage in closet facilities was readily apparent. Slightly less than one-fourth of all the houses had closets. The percentage of dwellings without clothes or storage closets of any type, in the various counties, ranged from 98 percent in San Miguel County to 48 percent in Beltrami County.

## Facilities

The houses were nearly all heated by fireplaces or stoves. As a rule, heat was found in only one room other than the kitchen. Most frequently the entire family hovered around one small fireplace. Less than 2 percent of the homes reported the use of furnaces.

The use of kerosene lamps was almost universal. Electricity was used in only 4 percent of all the homes. It was not used in any of the homes in Oglethorpe, Laurens, Knox, and Grayson Counties, but was used by nearly one-half of the families in Thurston County.

Considerably more than half of the families obtained their water supply from open, unprotected wells and springs. In San Miguel County more than two-thirds of the families obtained their water from irrigation ditches. Kitchen sinks and drains were nonexistent in all except three counties, and there the number reported was very small.

Less than one-fifth of all families had sanitary privies, whereas more than three-fifths were using unimproved privies and the rest were without toilet facilities of any kind.

### Household Equipment and Conveniences

Most of these families lacked the bare necessities essential to good housekeeping, health, and orderly living. They had too little with which to provide comfortable, healthful, and cheerful home environment. If one has a little with which to work, much may be accomplished through creative effort, but too many of these families did not have enough of anything to stimulate creative possibilities. For example, one family of 10 had only four beds, one sheet, four quilts, and one blanket. Their dishes consisted of one china plate, five tin plates, two bowls, no cups, no saucers, two knives, and three forks. As a rule the furniture, what little there was of it, consisted of bare, scarred, and nondescript pieces that were rickety from long use and too much moving. However, a few families had some comfortable and well-selected furniture and fairly adequate equipment which, though not in keeping with their present economic status, was a symbol of past achievement.

#### Linens

Many families did not have a change of bed linens or sufficient quilts and blankets to keep them warm. Even though the houses were as a rule cold and drafty, many families were lucky to have one blanket - often they were forced to sleep in their clothes to keep warm. Sheets made from salt sacks were in common use. In the Georgia counties, fertilizer sacks were frequently used for towels and many times for bedding material. Flour sacks were utilized in making curtains and to cover kitchen vessels or for straining milk.

#### Kitchen utensils and equipment

There was an extreme shortage in cooking utensils and dishes; lard cans and buckets were in frequent use as kitchen vessels. Many families had only one skillet, one bread pan, and one pot in which to prepare and cook all their food with no additional utensils available for canning and preserving food. Stoves in nearly all cases were old and unfit for use. Pressure cookers were lacking in nearly one-half of the project homes. In Thurston County, where they appeared most frequently, less than one-third of the families owned or used them. An average of only 5 percent of all the families had ice boxes or refrigerators.

#### Facilities

A sewing machine was found in more than two-thirds of the homes; considerably less than one-fifth of all the families had washing machines, only one-fourth radios, and less than one-tenth had telephones. In counties such as Laurens, Oglethorpe, Knox, Reynolds, and San Miguel, very few of these items, if any, were found (table 25) whereas, in



Beltrami County, the percentage of families using them ran from 40 to 80 percent. Although Thurston County reported no telephones, more than three-fourths of the families had sewing machines and more than two-thirds had radios.

#### Bedding

Very few families had adequate beds and mattresses and many children slept on straw mattresses placed on the floor. The average number of beds per family was 2.9, while the average-size family consists of 5.3 members. Thus, slightly more than one-half of the families averaged as much as one-half of a bed per person, and when such factors as age, sex, and variation in family size were taken into consideration, many families had considerably less adequate bedding facilities. Comparatively the same shortage existed in mattresses. The average number of mattresses per family was 3.0. In Laurens, Reynolds, and San Miguel Counties, an average of one more mattress than beds was reported.

### Self-Sufficiency

Failure of these families to produce products for home use in most cases necessitated the expenditure of all their cash income for food. Although their home-use production activities had in some instances been retarded by poor tenure relations, there was also evidence of a lack of appreciation of the importance and economic benefits of home production. The story of this deficiency is repeated again and again in the case histories of these families, of which the following is typical: "The food crop has been neglected during the entire 13 years that this couple have been married. It has taken all the cash crop for the purchase of food which should have been grown on the farm--no meat and lard have been produced and although there are three children, the family has never owned a cow. At present only three hens are owned to provide home food for the family. The children are undernourished and the mother has pellagra."

#### Food

Inadequate incomes and failure to raise gardens caused a decided lack of variety and nutritional efficiency in diets of these families which consist chiefly of dried beans, bread, and meat. Many were either entirely without milk or had only a scant supply. A serious shortage of hogs and poultry for home consumption also existed.

The average number of months during which milk was used by families having milk was 7, and the average for eggs was 9 months. Approximately one-third of the families were without milk the entire year, and one-fourth of them did not have eggs. The most pronounced milk shortage occurred in Laurens County where more than two-thirds of the families did not have milk during any part of the year (1938) and in Reynolds County where more than one-half of the families were without it. Nearly one-half of the families in Thurston, Beltrami, and Reynolds Counties were without eggs during the entire year.

The extent of nutritional deficiency among many of the families was further exemplified by the fact that more than half of the families having milk did not consume the required quantity according to standards set by the home supervisors in each county, and more than two-thirds of them fell below the standard requirement for eggs.

The inadequacy of gardens was reflected in the few months during which home-produced foods were used; the average number of months for various fruits and vegetables ranged from only 2 to 5 months, whereas it would have been possible to grow vegetables and fruits over a period of at least 6 to 8 months. Some of the reasons listed for not having gardens were: "No seed," "no fence," "landlord objects," "no time," and "just never have."



The average quantity of canned vegetables, fruits, and other foods was only 124 quarts per family per year. Nearly half of the families canned less than 75 quarts and more than one-fifth did not can any. In San Miguel County nearly nine-tenths of the families did not can any fruits or vegetables. The average quantities of the various kinds of foods stored in most cases, were meager and obviously inadequate. Potatoes were stored by more families than any other food item.

The insufficient production of food plus the small amount of cash expended on this item serves to further emphasize the inadequate diets of many of these families. The average cash spent for food was only \$127, with slightly more than half of the families spending less than \$100.

Improvements of level of living through own efforts

More than three-fourths of the families made some of their clothing and slightly more than half were reported as having repaired their own shoes. Over three-fourths made some type of house furnishings, such as bedding, furniture, and curtains. Only about one-third did anything to improve their yards.

That many of these families were thrifty and took pride in making their homes more cheerful and attractive is illustrated by the following excerpts from case narratives: "The overalls and shirt that the little girl was wearing, as well as the dress the mother wore, was made from guano sacks"...."They had papered the rough unceiled walls with newspapers to make the place look cleaner and more attractive." ..... "Just recently she papered her rooms with scraps of wallpaper turned wrong side out; she could not afford the cheapest paper for both rooms (81 cents per room) so asked for scraps that she could turn wrong side out and which cost 20 cents per room."...."The house is built of slabs. It has a latchstring on the door. It is neat and clean and shows care has been taken to make it livable. The curtains are made of flour sacks and the coverlets from small tobacco sacks."

### Health Conditions

Being ill housed, ill fed, and ill clothed does not promote good health. The social and psychological conditions and environment of these families make living for them precarious. In addition, many knew nothing of vaccination and immunization as a protection against diseases. They could not afford medical advice and attention. Many were not able to have the services of a doctor at the birth of a child, and prenatal care was unheard of.

### Illness and defects

The majority of these families were undernourished and handicapped by defects and disabilities which obviously result in a loss in productivity and efficiency from both an economic and social standpoint. Nearly half of the families reported illness of some kind during the 2 years previous to becoming FSA borrowers. The average number reporting illness, in various counties, ranged from 23 percent in Oglethorpe to 78 percent in Laurens County. No doubt there were many who were ill and failed to report or were unable to recall minor illnesses. The percentage of indebtedness attributed to medical bills was fairly consistent to the number of days' illness. That is to say that counties reporting the highest number of days of illness, as a rule, showed a comparable rating in regard to medical indebtedness.

County-wide surveys made in Laurens and Oglethorpe Counties revealed that in these particular counties approximately 75 percent of the persons examined had defective teeth; 50 percent, diseased tonsils; 21 percent, rickets; and 85 percent of the women were in need of repairs of the perineum. Special diets were recommended for approximately two-thirds of all the families surveyed in these counties. A little more than one-fourth of the members of project families in Laurens County had hookworm.



### Community and Organizational Participation

Like scattered, retarded drippings, community and governmental services had reached these families, when and if they did, in such an inadequate measure and unrelated manner, that no family may be said to have been satisfactorily served.

#### Religions

In many rural communities, churches served as focal points of social activity because of the absence of clubs, lodges, societies, lecture groups, etc. Such was the case in all project areas, yet only about one-half of the project families took part in church activities during the period from 1933 through 1938. Failure to participate in these activities may be attributed largely to the lack of sufficient clothing and the isolated locations in which the families lived.

#### Governmental

Throughout the period 1933-38 considerably more than half of the families received no benefits from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and approximately three-fourths of these families who, in the main, live on impoverished and submarginal land, reported no participation in the Soil Conservation Service programs. The number who had previously received Rural Rehabilitation loans and grants was so small as to be negligible. However, about two-thirds of these empty-handed families, beaten by crop failure, utter exhaustion from years of struggle, and depletion of work in mills, mines, and timber, had received relief.

#### Business and Educational

Here again the project families had been deprived, to a marked and almost universal degree, of the essential organizations which could and should bring them together in harmonious working groups and furnish information and services that would be most effective in promoting their welfare by enabling them to operate their farms more profitably and by enlivening and directing their interest toward the enhancement of their communities. In some counties not a single person was touched by or received benefits from any of the business and educational organizations such as livestock breeders' associations, cooperative buying or selling, vocational courses, homemakers' clubs, farm demonstration activities, FFA, and 4-H clubs.

Approximately one-third of all the families did not participate in the programs of any agency or community activity other than that of church and relief; and in Grundy County over one-third of the families did not participate in any activity during the entire period 1933-38.

#### Leadership

Because institutional facilities were so scarce in most of these counties, there was little opportunity for the development of leadership. There was not a single county in which as many as one-fourth of the families had any member who held an appointive or elective position in any public or private organization from the years 1933 through 1938.



Appendixes

A. - PROJECTION AREAS BY COUNTIES

<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Description of Area</u>	<u>Number of families as of March 1939</u>
Georgia	Laurens	Outside of Southern plantation area; predominance of white sharecroppers.	50
Georgia	Oglethorpe	Relative large proportion of Negro sharecroppers.	48
Kentucky	Knox	Southern Appalachian Area; outside heart of coal-mining section; one of poorest counties in Appalachian area.	56
Minnesota	Beltrami	Lakes States Cut-Over Area.	45
Missouri	Grundy	Prosperous farm area of the Ozarks interspersed with low-income farm families	16
Missouri	Reynolds	Ozark Area in which low-income farm families are definitely in the majority	44
New Mexico	San Miguel	Area in which the population is predominately Spanish-American.	55
Vermont	Orange	New England Area where there is considerable part-time farming.	NA
Virginia	Grayson	Southern Appalachian Area—predominately agricultural.	36
Washington	Thurston	Northwest part-time farming area.	16
West Virginia	Mercer	Southern Appalachian Area where many recently turned from coal mining to agriculture.	42

B. - SCHEDULES AND INSTRUCTIONS

I. Schedules

1. Application for rehabilitation--Form FSA-RR-12
2. Farm-and home-management plans-- Form FSA-RR-14 and 14a
3. Supplementary schedule--SP-Form 1

II. Instructions

Farm and home supervisors working with Experimental Project families are requested to fill in a copy each of Forms RR-12,14,14a and supplement 1 to RR-14 for every family included in the program. This information is needed to work out plans for the rehabilitation of the family and it is the duty of the supervisors to make certain that this is clear to the family. The purpose of these forms is to provide detailed information concerning these families at the time they are taken into the program, or before.

Every item should be carefully filled out, by a check mark (x), a number, or the entry of the items called for. If the information for any item cannot be obtained, "Not Available" (NA) should be written in the proper space. If the question does not apply, a dash is to be entered. Space is provided for listing other appropriate items not already included.





## TYPE OF LOAN

☐ New ☐ Std. ☐ Corp.  
☐ Sup. ☐ Coop. ☐ FSA  
☐ TP ☐ Subs. ☐ RP

## FARM AND HOME MANAGEMENT PLAN

## Part I.—PERSONAL DATA

Application No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Case No. \_\_\_\_\_RP Only Project No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Unit No. \_\_\_\_\_We 

{	Mr.
	Mrs.
	Miss

 \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant's name) (Known as) (Spouse)

\_\_\_\_\_ submit the  
(R. F. D. No.) (Box No.) (Post office) (County) (State)  
following information regarding our present conditions and future plans. The farm on which this Farm  
Management Plan is to be put into operation is known as \_\_\_\_\_ which is situated \_\_\_\_\_ miles  
(Name of farm or owner) (Number)  
\_\_\_\_\_ from \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ miles from \_\_\_\_\_  
(Direction) (Name nearest shipping point) (Number) (Direction) (Nearest school)  
on \_\_\_\_\_ It is located in section \_\_\_\_\_; township \_\_\_\_\_; range \_\_\_\_\_

We are {owner} of \_\_\_\_\_ acres. We have a written lease, copy attached, for \_\_\_\_\_ year(s) {with} {without}  
renewal clause. It provides for \_\_\_\_\_ shares and/or \$\_\_\_\_\_ annual cash rental payments, due  
Number in household \_\_\_\_\_ Age of members: Father \_\_\_\_\_; mother \_\_\_\_\_; other men and boys \_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_; other women and girls \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

## Part II.—REPORT OF OUR LAST YEAR'S BUSINESS

Beginning \_\_\_\_\_ Ending \_\_\_\_\_  
(Month) (Day) (Year) (Month) (Day) (Year)  
We {will} {will not} operate the same farm this coming year.

Table A—OUR CROP PRODUCTION AND SALES

WE PRODUCED					WE SOLD	
CROP	Acres	Per acre	Total	Our share	Quantity	Value
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	\$_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Subtotal	_____	x x x	x x x x	x x x x x	TOTAL	\$_____

Table B—LIVESTOCK AND PRODUCE SALES

ITEM	WE SOLD	
	Quantity	Value
Dairy products	_____	\$_____
Cattle	_____	_____
Hogs	_____	_____
Sheep	_____	_____
Poultry	_____	_____
Eggs	_____	_____
TOTAL	x x x x x	\$_____

Cropland in pasture \_\_\_\_\_  
Cropland fallowed \_\_\_\_\_  
Cropland idle \_\_\_\_\_  
Total cropland \_\_\_\_\_  
Permanent pasture \_\_\_\_\_  
Wood s not pastured \_\_\_\_\_  
Farmstead, roads, etc. \_\_\_\_\_  
Total acres \_\_\_\_\_

Table D—OUR FARM AND HOME EXPENDITURES

Cash farm operating expenses	\$_____
Cash family operating expenses	_____
Capital goods purchased	_____
Paid on FSA and/or corp. loans	_____
Paid on all other debts	_____
TOTAL	\$_____

Table C—OUR OTHER INCOME

FSA grant	\$_____
Misc. employment	_____
A. A. A. payment	_____
TOTAL	\$_____

TOTAL VALUE OF OUR SHARE OF ALL CROPS SOLD (Table A) \_\_\_\_\_ \$\_\_\_\_\_  
TOTAL CASH INCOME, ALL SOURCES (Summation tables A, B, C) \_\_\_\_\_  
Minus TOTAL MONEY SPENT FOR FARM AND HOME (Table D) \_\_\_\_\_  
NET CASH SURPLUS \_\_\_\_\_ \$\_\_\_\_\_

Additional information about our last year's business:

Pounds of milk (or butterfat) produced per cow. (Average number of cows \_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of eggs produced per hen. (Average number of hens \_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of pigs raised per litter. (Number of litters \_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_  
Percent of income from crops \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Percent of income from livestock \_\_\_\_\_ %



PAGE 2  
(Optional with Region)

### YEAR'S FARM AND HOME EXPENSES

We paid out for family living	\$
We paid out for farm operating	\$
We purchased capital goods	\$
We paid out on all debts	\$
We paid out in all last year	\$

We borrowed last year \$ from

We canned: ----- quarts vegetables, ----- quarts fruits, ----- gallons sorghum, ----- quarts meat; other -----

We plan to have the following crops and livestock:

## VII. OUR RESOURCES AND DEBT

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

## Part IV.—FINANCIAL STATEMENT

As of \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_\_\_\_

Table I—ASSETS (what we own)

Table J—LIABILITIES (what we owe)

Items	Number or quantity	Value	Subtotals	Type of debt— To whom owed	Present debt	Adjusted to	To be paid by FSA loan	To be paid with own funds this year
Land		\$	\$	Real-estate mortgages:				
Improvements					\$	\$	\$	\$
Machinery and equipment:								
				Interest:				
Livestock:				Personal-property liens:				
Work								
Dairy cattle								
Beef cattle								
Hogs								
Sheep								
Poultry								
Feed:				Crop liens:				
Seed:				Past due taxes:				
				Past due cash rent:				
Growing crops:				Other debts:				
Miscellaneous farm supplies								
TOTAL FARM PROPERTY								
Household goods								
Food on hand								
Cash on hand				Judgments:				
Accounts receivable								
Cash value life insurance								
GRAND TOTAL	x x x	x x x x x	\$	GRAND TOTAL	\$	\$	\$	\$

What we own \$ \_\_\_\_\_ minus what we owe \$ \_\_\_\_\_ gives our NET WORTH \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Does any relative, or others, claim any interest in any assets listed? \_\_\_\_\_ If so, give full particulars

I am endorser on notes, \$ \_\_\_\_\_; guarantor on obligations, \$ \_\_\_\_\_; bondsman for \$ \_\_\_\_\_



### Table M—CAPITAL GOODS WE EXPECT TO BUY

ITEM	TOTAL EXPENSE	WE CAN PAY	WE NEED TO BORROW
Farm:			
New buildings.....	\$.....	\$.....	\$.....
New machinery.....	.....	.....	.....
Livestock.....	.....	.....	.....
Group services.....	.....	.....	.....
Household goods:			
Maj. equip. and furn.....	.....	.....	.....
Major house imp.....	.....	.....	.....
Old debts: (J)			
.....	.....	.....	.....
Other.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL CAPITAL.....	\$.....	\$.....	\$.....

We need to borrow (total of Tables K, L, M) \$

ITEMS	Table	THIS YEAR	19---
Receipts:			
Crop sales.....	E	\$-----	\$-----
Livestock sales.....	F	-----	-----
Livestock products.....	G	-----	-----
A. A. A. payments.....		-----	-----
Other farm income.....		-----	-----
-----		-----	-----
TOTAL RECEIPTS.....		\$-----	\$-----
Expenses:			
Farm operating expense.....	K	-----	-----
Family operating expense.....	L	-----	-----
-----		-----	-----
TOTAL EXPENSES.....		\$-----	\$-----
Net cash income.....		\$-----	\$-----

Total cash receipts (Table N).....	\$.....
Expenses paid by us (Tables K, L, and M).....	.....
Balance available for payment.....	.....
Payment on FSA loan.....	.....
<b>BALANCE</b> .....	<b>\$.....</b>

ITEM	INTEREST RATE	AMOUNT OWED	REPAYMENTS				
			1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year	5th year
FSA loan this year: Operating (L)_____		\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____
Capital (M)_____							
Previous FSA loans_____							
R. R. Corporation loan_____							
Other debts we can pay (M)_____							
Other_____							
TOTAL_____	X X X	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____

Applicant \_\_\_\_\_ Homemaker \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: RR Sup. \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
                                           Home Sup. \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 APPROVED: Dist. Sup. or Loan App. Off. \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Part III.—CROP AND LIVESTOCK PROGRAM

**Table E—ESTIMATED PRODUCTION AND DISPOSAL OF CROPS**

NAME OF CROP	ACRES	TO BE USED		PRODUCTION			AMOUNT ON HAND	TOTAL SUPPLY	FARM AND HOME USE			FOR SALE		
		Seed	Ferti- lizer	Per acre	Total	Operator's share			Feed	Food	Carry-over and seed	Quan- tity	Price	Value
														\$.....
Garden.....				x x x	x x x x		x x x		x x x			x x x	x x x	
Fallow, idle....		x x x	x x x	x x x	x x x x	x x x x	x x x		x x x	x x x	x x x x	x x x	x x x	x x x x
Pasture.....				x x x	x x x x	x x x x	x x x		x x x	x x x	x x x x			
TOTAL.....		x x x	x x x	x x x	x x x x	x x x x	x x x		x x x	x x x	x x x x	x x x	x x x	\$.....

Table F—ESTIMATED PRODUCTION AND DISPOSAL OF LIVESTOCK

KIND OF LIVESTOCK	NUMBER ON HAND	TO BE PURCHASED	TO BE PRODUCED	TOTAL	OPERA- TOR'S SHARE	DEATH LOSS	HOME USE	CARRY- OVER	FOR SALE		
									Number	Price per unit	Value
											\$
TOTAL.....	x x x x	x x x x	x x x x	x x x x	x x x x	x x x x	x x x x	x x x x	x x x	x x x	\$

Table G—ESTIMATED PRODUCTION AND DISPOSAL OF LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS

KIND OF PRODUCT	NUMBER PRODUCING ANIMALS	PRODUCTION PER ANIMAL	TOTAL PRODUCTION	OPERATOR'S SHARE	FARM USE	HOME USE	FOR SALE		
							Quantity	Price per unit	Value
Butterfat.....									\$.....
Whole milk.....									
Eggs.....									
Wool.....									
TOTAL.....	X X X X X	X X X X X	X X X X X X X	X X X X X	X X X X	X X X X	X X X X X	X X X X	\$.....

Table H—FEED TO BE CONSUMED FOR (.....) MONTHS, ENDING .....

[illegible]

\*Indicate: T=Temporary; P=Permanent.

Cost of feed to be purchased by landlord, \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Cost of feed to be purchased by operator, \$ \_\_\_\_\_



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATIONName..... **FARM AND HOME MANAGEMENT PLAN**Date..... **Part VI.—HOME SECTION**

Application No. ....

Diet guide used..... **OUR PLAN FOR FOOD (Table I)**

Case No. ....

LINE	OUR FAMILY SHOULD USE	THESE FOOD GROUPS	WE PLAN TO USE	WE PLAN TO PRODUCE		WE PLAN TO BUY		OUR FARM NEEDS TO PROVIDE	
				Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value		
1	{qt. gal. bf. lb.}	Whole milk.....			\$.....		\$.....	COWS	
2		Cheese.....							
3		Butter.....							
4		TOTAL.....							
5	lb.	Table fats and oils.....						hogs	
6		Lard, fat pork, bacon.....							
7		TOTAL.....							
8	lb.	Lean pork.....						birds	
9		Beef and veal.....							
10		Mutton and lamb.....							
11		Fish and game.....						acres in garden	
12		Poultry.....							
13		TOTAL.....							
14	doz.	Eggs.....						acres in orchard	
15									
16	lb.	Dried beans, peas, and nuts.....							
17								acres	
18	lb.	Tomatoes.....							
19		Citrus.....							
20								acres	
21	lb.	Leafy, green, and yellow veg.....							
22									
23	lb.	Other vegetables.....						acres	
24									
25	lb.	Fruit.....							
26								acres	
27	lb.	Potatoes—White.....							
28		Sweet.....							
29		TOTAL.....						acres	
30									
31	lb.	Flour.....							
32		Cereal.....						acres	
33									
34		TOTAL.....							
35								acres	
36	lb.	Sugar.....							
37		Sirup, sorghum, etc.....							
38		TOTAL.....						acres	
39		Food accessories.....							
40		Cod-liver oil.....							
41	Total value of Food we plan To PRODUCE at..... prices.....				\$.....	To BUY..... \$.....			
42	Value of FUEL we plan to provide from farm.....					Value of Food we have on hand:			
43	Total value of Food and FUEL from the farm.....				\$.....	Stored, \$..... Canned, \$.....			
44	Quarts of canned food on hand: Date.....		Quarts of food we plan to can this year:		We have these containers on hand:		We need to buy these containers:		Total value of foods furnished from farm for home use last year: \$.....
45	Vegetables.....		Vegetables.....		....., .....		....., .....		
46	Tomatoes.....		Tomatoes.....		....., .....		....., .....		
47	Fruit.....		Fruit.....		....., .....		....., .....		
48	Meats.....		Meats.....		....., .....		....., .....		

(Table 2)

TOTAL	\$	
-------	----	--

(Table 3)

TOTAL \$

(Table 4)

TOTAL	\$	
-------	----	--

(Table 5)

TOTAL	\$	
-------	----	--

(Table 6)

TOTAL	\$	
-------	----	--

Number of bedrooms with 1 bed -----, with 2 beds -----

## MINOR FURNISHINGS

(Table 7)

TOTAL\_ \$\_\_\_\_\_

(Table 8)

TOTAL	\$	
-------	----	--

(Table 9)

TOTAL \$

(Summary Table 10)

TOTAL FAMILY OPER. BUDGET-----	\$-----	\$-----	\$-----
-----------------------------------	---------	---------	---------

[illegible]

CAPITAL GOODS	\$		\$		\$	
---------------	----	--	----	--	----	--

TOTAL FAMILY						
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>1</sup> Enter major house improvement expenses for which a long-time loan is needed in summary table 10 under "capital goods." Enter all other housing expenses for minor upkeep improvement, and repairs in table 6.



County \_\_\_\_\_

A. Residence				County
Date	Township or town	County	State	Name
Jan. 1 1935				Application No. Case No.
Apr. 1 1930				RR. Supervisor H.M. Supervisor

[illegible]

D. Elective or appointive positions held last year

Line No.	Agency or activity	33	34	35	36	37	38	Line No.	Organization	Name of person	Title
1	A. A. L. Program										
2	S. C. S. Contract	x	x						Public		
3	Rural Rehab. Loans	x						1	Township		
4	Rural Rehab. Grants	x						2	School District		
5	W. P. A.	x	x					3	County		
6	Relief							4			
7	Natl. Youth Adm.	x	x								
8	Civ. Conserv. Corps								Private		
9	Home Makers Club							5	Church		
10	Farm Demonstration							6	Church Soc.		
11	Four-H Club							7	School Soc.		
12	Church							8	Lodge		
13	Courses, Voc. Agr.							9	Farmers' Org.		
14	Courses, Voc. Hmk.							10	Coop.		
15	Fut. Fms. of Amer.							11	Women's Club		
16	Coop. selling							12	Four-H Club		
17	Coop. buying for home							13			
18	Coop. buying for farm							14			
19	Livestock Brds. Assn.							15			
20								16			
21								17			

E. Home produced foods during last 12 months

Line No.	Our family used these food groups	We had fresh during (Indicate by "x")												Our family used last week	We didn't raise these foods because
		J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D		
1	Whole milk													qts.	
2	Cheese (in addition to milk)													lbs.	
3	Butter (in addition to milk)													lbs.	
4	Table fat and oil													lbs.	
5	Lard, fat pork, bacon													lbs.	
6	Lean meat - lean pork													lbs.	
7	Beef and veal													lbs.	
8	Mutton and lamb													lbs.	
9	Fish and game													lbs.	
10	Poultry													lbs.	
11	Eggs													doz.	
12	Dried beans, peas, & nuts													lbs.	
13	Tomatoes													qts.	
14	Citrus fruit													doz.	
15	Leafy green & Yellow veg.														
16	Lettuce													Serv.	
17	Greens													Serv.	
18	Cabbage													Serv.	
19	Peas and beans													Serv.	
20															
21	Other vegetables													Serv.	
22															
23															
24	Fruits													Serv.	
25															
26															
27															
28	Potatoes														
29	Irish													lbs.	
30	Sweet													lbs.	
31	Flour														
32	Corn													lbs.	
33	Wheat													lbs.	
34	Cereal													lbs.	
35	Sugar - Maple													lbs.	
36	Syrups													qts.	
37	Honey													qts.	

F. Last year we-

Canned:	Stored, dried, or otherwise processed:	
	lbs. Butter	Bu. Potatoes, sweet
qts. Vegetables	lbs. Salt pork	Bu. Potatoes, white
	lbs. Bacon	lbs. Corn meal
qts. Tomatoes	lbs. Lard	lbs. Hominy
	lbs. Frozen meats	lbs. Wheat flour
qts. Fruit	doz. Eggs	Bu. Fruit
	lbs. Dried beans	gals. Syrup
qts. Meats	lbs. Dried peas	gals. Sorghum
	Bu. Winter squash	gals. Honey

How many children took Cod liver oil regularly last year? \_\_\_\_\_

How many pounds of coffee were purchased last month? \_\_\_\_\_



G. Housing and household equipment

H. Housing

(Check (x). Write in items if not listed)
Construction materials
Log
Wood frame (unpainted)
Wood frame (painted)
Principal heating system
Fire place
Kitchen stove
Heating stove
Water supply and facilities
Spring
Open well
Hand pump outdoors
Hand pump in kitchen
Kitchen sink and drain
Well or spring properly enclosed
Sanitation
Unimproved privy
Sanitary privy
No toilet
Principal lighting system
Kerosene lamp
Gasoline lamp
Food storage space
Cellar or cave
Fruit or smoke house
Equipment
Sewing machine
Loom
Spinning wheel
Quilting frames
Washing machine
Ice box or refrigerator
Pressure cooker
Phonograph
Organ
Piano
Radio
Telephone
Place for valuable papers
Clothes closets

Items	Number
Age of house (Years)	
Total number of rooms	
Number used for sleeping	
Total number of windows	
Total number of windows screened	
(Check condition) (x)	Good Fair Poor
Roof	
Floors	
Walls	
Foundation	
Screens	
Steps	

I. Furniture and furnishings made or reconditioned by household

Item	No. on hand	How many of these were made by members of the household	How many of these were reconditioned by members of the household
Chairs			
Tables			
Beds			
Mattresses			
Sheets			
Quilts			
Pillows			
Feather beds			
Brooms			

J. Principal means of transportation

None: Walk
Horseback or muleback
Wagon or buggy
Automobile or truck
Make Year - model
Year - purchase

K. Recreational activities

During the last 12 months how many members of household went	Number of persons	How often did most frequent attendant go?	Cash cost per household
Hunting			
Fishing			
To movies			
To ball games			
To dances			
To parties or picnics			

L. Improving the level of living  
through our own efforts

Line No.	Last year we did (Check)	Items (Add others not included in list)	Next year we plan to do (Check)
1		Mak. clths-dress	
2		Chld's clothes	
3		Men's shirts	
4			
5		Repair. shoes	
6		Making furnish.	
7		Bedding	
8		Mattresses	
9		Curtains	
10		Chairs	
11		Tables	
12			
13		Making soap	
14		House repairs -	
15		Screen	
16		Porch	
17		Roof	
18			
19		Paint. hsc. in.	
20		House outside	
21		Furniture	
22		Papering	
23		Bldg. cupboards	
24		Shelves	
25		Chicken house	
26		Hog pen	
27		Wagon box	
28			
29		Making toys	
30		Put. up swings	
31		Improv. yard	
32		Plant. flowers	
33		Plant. shrubs	
34		Plant. trees	
35		Repair. fence	
36		Gate	
37			
38		Rep. harness	
39			
40			

M. Farm operations

Line No.	Soil treatment on this land	Year when done last	Acres treated then
1	Limed		
2	Plowed under legum. crop		
3	Renov. & treated perm. past.		
4	How much agricultural land on this farm:		Acres
	a. has been allowed to grow up to brush after having been cleared?		
	b. is in abandoned or broken down orchard?		
	c. Could be used as woodlot?		
5	How much land on this farm could be brot cultiv. by:		
	a. drainage		
	b. irrigation		
	c. water facilities		
	d. terracing		

N. Cash spent last year

Line No.	Object	Amount
1	Food	\$
2	Feed	
3	Fertilizer	
4	Livestock replacements	
5	Labor	

O. Classify livestock

Line No.	Class	No. of head on this farm	No. of sires used last year
1	Scrub		
2	Grade		
3	High grade		
4	Pure bred		

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Date completed: \_\_\_\_\_



C. - TABLES.

Table 1.- Average length of residence in present county, distribution by years' residence, average farm experience and distribution of number years' farming experience

County and State	Percentage distribution of years residence in county										Percentage distribution of years farming experience									
	Average No. of years residence in county	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :<																		

Table 2. - Average Age of Operators and Homemakers and Distribution by Age Groups

County and State	Average age of operator	Percentage distribution by age groups				Average age of homemaker	Percentage distribution by age groups			
		Under 25	25-34	35-44	45 and over		Under 25	25-34	35-44	45 and over
Laurens, Ga.	36	4.0	46.0	34.0	16.0	32	20.8	47.9	22.9	8.3
Oglethorpe, Ga.	38	16.7	33.3	25.0	25.0	33	25.0	40.9	18.2	15.9
Knox, Ky.	40	9.1	29.1	18.2	43.6	34	21.8	29.1	30.9	18.2
Beltrami, Minn.	40	2.2	28.9	31.1	37.8	35	12.2	39.0	34.1	14.6
Grundy, Mo.	30	31.3	56.3	6.2	6.2	27	31.3	56.3	6.2	6.2
Reynolds, Mo.	40	2.3	36.4	29.5	31.8	36	19.0	33.3	21.4	26.2
San Miguel, N.M.	48	1.8	24.1	22.2	51.9	41	13.3	24.4	20.0	42.2
Grayson, Va.	41	-	38.9	16.7	44.4	37	18.8	28.1	28.1	25.0
Thurston, Wash.	50	-	-	25.0	75.0	45	-	21.4	28.6	50.0
Mercer, W. Va.	42	2.4	28.6	28.6	40.5	36	22.0	19.5	36.6	21.9
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All Counties	41	5.9	32.5	24.9	36.7	35	19.0	33.6	25.7	21.7



Table 3. - The Extent of Educational Attainment Enjoyed by the Farm Operators and Homemakers of the NCF Families

County and State	Percentage of total				Percentages of total			
	Average grade completed by operator	completing certain grades : Less than 4	completing certain grades : 4-7	completing certain grades : 8-10 and over	Average grade completed by homemaker	completing certain grades : Less than 4	completing certain grades : 4-7	completing certain grades : 8-10 and over
Laurens, Ga.	4.2	40.8	44.9	14.3	5.6	22.9	60.4	16.7
Oglethorpe, Ga.	3.8	46.7	42.2	11.1	5.6	14.3	61.9	19.0
Knox, Ky.	6.2	18.5	29.6	50.0	6.4	11.5	46.2	38.5
Beltrami, Minn.	7.6	---	28.6	69.0	8.3	---	12.8	61.5
Grundy, Mo.	7.8	6.2	18.8	62.5	10.1	---	6.3	50.0
Reynolds, Mo.	6.6	7.1	38.1	54.8	6.4	7.5	45.0	47.5
San Miguel, N.M.	3.4	49.1	49.0	1.9	3.5	53.3	42.2	4.5
Grayson, Va.	4.7	21.9	75.0	3.1	6.1	11.5	69.2	11.5
Thurston, Wash.	7.9	---	35.7	57.2	8.8	---	25.0	50.0
Mercer, W. Va.	6.1	20.0	40.0	31.4	6.7	5.7	48.6	40.0
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	5.5	24.9	41.1	31.9	6.2	15.5	45.1	31.5
				2.1				7.9

Table 4. - Average size of Family, Distribution According to Size, the Average Number of Children for Family and Age Distribution

County and State	Percentage distribution of families according to size					Average number persons per family	Percentage distribution by age groups		
	Average number persons per family	2 or less	3-5	6-9	10 and over		Average number children per family	Children: under 16 years	Children: 16 years and over
Laurens, Ga.	5.8	2.0	54.0	36.0	8.0	3.9	85.1	14.9	8.8
Oglethorpe, Ga.	5.6	6.2	43.8	45.8	4.2	3.5	86.5	13.5	8.8
Knox, Ky.	5.5	7.1	51.8	35.7	5.4	3.3	88.5	11.5	8.2
Beltrami, Minn.	5.2	13.3	46.7	33.3	6.7	3.2	84.7	15.3	11.1
Grundy, Mo.	3.4	37.5	56.3	6.2	-	1.3	95.0	5.0	-
Reynolds, Mo.	5.4	11.4	45.4	43.2	-	3.3	79.5	20.5	13.7
San Miguel, N.M.	5.0	23.6	41.8	27.3	7.3	3.0	75.9	24.1	18.1
Grayson, Va.	5.4	2.8	52.8	36.1	8.3	3.3	80.5	19.5	13.6
Thurston, Wash.	3.8	25.0	62.5	12.5	-	1.9	53.3	46.7	33.3
Mercer, W. Va.	5.9	2.4	42.8	50.0	4.8	3.7	79.5	20.5	12.8
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	5.3	10.8	48.3	35.8	5.1	3.3	82.3	17.7	12.0



Table 5. - Proportion of Ownership and Tenancy

Class of Tenure	All counties	Laurens, Ga.	Oglethorpe, Ga.	Knox, Ky.	Beltrami, Minn.	Grundy, Mo.	Reynolds, Mo.	San Miguel, N. Mex.	Grayson, Va.	Thurston, Wash.	Mercer, W. Va.	Orange, Va.
Owners	56.5	2.0	-	71.4	93.3	12.5	61.4	89.8	80.6	100.0	61.9	NA
Full owners	49.5	2.0	-	71.4	84.4	6.2	31.8	89.8	63.9	93.8	54.8	NA
Part owners <u>1/</u>	7.0	-	-	-	8.9	6.3	29.6	-	16.7	6.2	7.1	NA
Tenants	43.5	98.0	100.0	23.6	6.7	87.5	38.6	10.2	19.4	-	38.1	NA

1/ Part owner - when additional land is rented.

Table 6. - Size of Farm and Land Use

County and State	Percentage distribution of average total acreage by groups										Percentage of total acreage in ---		
	Average: total :		Under :		: 200		: 150-199:		and over:		: Permanent : Other		
	per farm:		25		: 25-49 :		50-99 :		100-149:		acres : pasture : acres		
Laurens, Ga.	54	-	33.3	66.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	85.5	4.6	9.9
Oglethorpe, Ga.	119	-	12.5	50.0	12.5	-	25.0	-	-	-	23.0	17.1	59.9
Knox, Ky.	79	7.1	28.6	35.7	14.3	10.7	3.6	-	-	-	37.5	9.7	52.8
Beltrami, Minn.	91	-	30.2	37.2	11.6	16.3	4.7	-	-	-	24.4	45.5	30.1
Grundy, Mo.	89	-	12.5	75.0	-	-	12.5	-	-	-	39.9	49.9	10.2
Reynolds, Mo.	83	15.0	22.5	25.0	22.5	12.5	2.5	-	-	-	33.0	23.1	43.9
San Miguel, N.M.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grayson, Va.	37	29.6	37.0	33.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	49.7	30.3	20.0
Thurston, Wash.	50	12.5	43.7	43.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	19.8	46.2	34.0
Mercer, W. Va.	66	15.8	23.7	36.8	21.1	-	2.6	-	-	-	25.9	40.1	34.0
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	73	10.0	28.5	39.2	11.9	6.9	3.5	-	-	-	35.0	27.7	37.3



Table 7. - Type of livestock and extent of ownership per family

County and State	Horses : and mules		Milk cows		Beef cattle		Hogs		Sheep : and lambs		Poultry	
	Aver.: no.:	Percent: without:	Aver.: no.:	Percent: without:	Aver.: no.:	Percent: without:	Aver.: no.:	Percent: without:	Aver.: no.:	Percent: without:	Aver.: no.:	Percent: without:
Laurens, Ga.	-	100.0	.1	85.7	.1	93.9	1.0	32.7	.0	98.0	26.5	26.5
Oglethorpe, Ga.	.1	89.6	.4	75.0	.5	70.8	1.3	39.6	.0	97.9	14.0	20.8
Knox, Ky.	1.0	32.1	1.5	16.1	.8	67.9	2.6	26.8	.4	91.1	37.3	14.3
Beltrami, Minn.	1.3	40.0	3.7	22.2	.8	55.6	2.6	40.0	5.3	75.6	24.5	53.3
Grundy, Mo.	.2	87.5	.6	56.3	.0	100.0	1.4	50.0	.0	100.0	37.7	18.8
Reynolds, Mo.	.6	65.9	.4	79.5	.3	86.4	3.7	50.0	.4	97.7	25.6	18.2
San Miguel, N.M.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grayson, Va.	.7	55.6	1.8	13.9	.4	77.8	2.0	22.2	1.1	88.9	19.6	11.1
Thurston, Wash.	.8	43.8	3.9	.0	.7	93.8	1.6	50.0	.0	100.0	97.1	25.0
Mercer, W. Va.	.7	54.8	1.0	47.6	.4	42.9	1.3	45.2	2.3	78.6	24.4	11.9
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	.6	62.7	1.3	47.2	.5	73.3	2.0	37.9	1.2	90.9	27.0	22.4

County	Average value	Percentage distribution of value	Percentage distribution of	Average value
and	of	of total assets by groups	total assets in relation	of assets
State	of	(dollars)	to -	minus
	assets	Less:	: 3000:Land	: value of land
	per	than:	: and:	: andland
	family:	50 : 100-: 200-: 500-: 1000-:	over: improve-: Machin-: Live-: Other: improvements	
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:

1/ Miscellaneous farm supplies (feed, seed, etc.), household goods, food on hand, cash on hand, accounts receivable, and cash value of life insurance.



Table 9. - Extent of farm encumbrances and relation to various items

County and State	Average indebtedness by groups (dollars)	Percentage distribution of total indebtedness by	Percentage distribution of total indebtedness in relation to --	Average indebtedness per family minus taxes and real estate mortgages									
	Less than 50	50-99	100-499	500 and over	Person- al prop- erty and mort- gages	Farm : supply : cal :	Groc- : ery :	Medi- cal :	Other :				
	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars				
Laurens, Ga.	27	22.4	61.2	12.2	2.1	2.1	-	13.9	23.5	18.7	31.5	12.4	27
Oglethorpe, Ga.	24	46.8	36.2	10.6	6.4	-	-	19.4	15.4	29.7	11.4	24.1	24
Knox, Ky.	163	23.2	19.7	12.5	21.4	19.6	3.6	32.8	-	1.2	.5	16.7	84
Peltrami, Minn.	554	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7	31.1	42.2	18.2	2.0	1.5	3.7	6.6	178
Grundy, Mo.	65	56.2	12.5	12.5	12.5	-	6.3	3.9	-	1.0	12.0	83.1	65
Reynolds, Mo.	175	-	38.6	15.9	15.9	20.5	9.1	12.6	13.2	6.4	14.4	6.9	93
San Miguel, N.M.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grayson, Va.	261	8.3	36.1	2.8	8.3	30.6	13.9	17.4	.2	4.7	4.2	3.5	78
Thurston, Wash.	944	6.3	-	6.2	12.5	37.5	37.5	34.4	3.7	3.4	.8	1.6	414
Mercer, W. Va.	289	7.1	26.2	14.3	16.7	16.7	19.0	12.5	-	2.0	9.1	18.0	120
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	233	18.2	29.9	10.6	11.1	15.7	14.5	21.1	3.1	3.4	5.4	9.5	99

Table 10.-Average Net Worth and Net Equity in land per family and the distribution of each by groups

County and State	:Percentage distribution			:Average			:Percentage distribution			Relation of net equity in land to net worth
	:Average:	:of total net worth by	:Average:	:of net equity in land by	:Average:	:of net equity in land by	:Percentage distribution	:of net equity in land by	:Average:	
	: net	: groups (dollars)	: net	: groups (dollars)	: net	: groups (dollars)	: net	: groups (dollars)	: net	
	: worth	:	: worth	:	: worth	:	: worth	:	: worth	
	: per	: Under:100-:200-:500-:	: per	: Under:100-:200-:500-:	: per	: Under:100-:200-:500-:	: per	: Under:100-:200-:500-:	: per	
	: family:	: 100 : 199 : 499 : 999:over:	: family:	: 100 : 199 : 499 : 999:over:	: family:	: 100 : 199 : 499 : 999:over:	: family:	: 100 : 199 : 499 : 999:over:	: family:	
	: Dollars	:	: Dollars	:	: Dollars	:	: Dollars	:	: Dollars	
Laurens, Ga.	72	30.6	38.8	30.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oglethorpe, Ga.	120	17.0	34.0	38.3	10.6	-	-	-	-	-
Knox, Ky.	878	-	5.4	25.0	35.7	33.9:	26.8	5.4	21.4	35.7
Beltrami, Minn.	1,256	-	-	11.1	37.8	51.1:	13.3	6.7	31.1	24.4
Grundy, Mo.	220	37.5	31.3	18.8	6.2	6.2:	87.5	-	-	12.5
Reynolds, Mo.	475	36.4	4.5	22.7	29.6	6.8:	50.0	9.1	15.9	18.2
San Miguel, N.M.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA:	NA	NA	NA	6.8
Grayson, Va.	804	2.8	13.9	11.1	36.1	36.1:	25.0	-	22.2	38.9
Thurston, Wash.	1,264	-	-	18.8	31.2	50.0:	6.2	-	18.8	25.0
Mercer, W. Va.	1,056	9.5	11.9	9.5	31.0	38.1:	40.5	-	14.3	23.8
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA:	NA	NA	NA	21.4
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA:	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	663	24.2	15.1	13.7	23.4	23.6:	32.9	3.9	19.6	27.1
										16.5
										59.1



Table 11. - Cash income - distribution and source

County and State	Average cash income per family	Percentage distribution of total cash income by group	% of total in- come drvd. from
	Dollars	Under 250 : 250-399 : 400-599 : 600-999 : 1,000 and over	Farm : Nonfarm
Laurens, Ga.	143	98.0 2.0 - - -	73.5 26.5
Oglethorpe, Ga.	105	97.8 2.2 - - -	52.5 47.5
Knox, Ky.	329	30.9 41.8 23.6 3.6 -	41.5 58.5
Beltrami, Minn.	642	11.1 13.3 28.9 31.1 15.6	28.4 71.6
Grundy, Mo.	259	53.3 26.7 20.0 - -	27.3 72.7
Reynolds, Mo.	359	18.2 47.7 27.3 6.8 -	19.9 80.1
San Miguel, N.M.	NA	NA NA NA NA NA	NA NA
Grayson, Va.	220	66.7 30.5 - 2.8 -	41.9 58.1
Thurston, Wash.	851	- 6.2 31.3 37.5 25.0	36.2 63.8
Mercer, W. Va.	404	24.4 39.0 22.0 7.3 7.3	28.2 71.8
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA NA NA NA NA	NA NA
All counties	329	37.4 24.4 25.0 9.2 4.0	35.5 64.5



Table 13. - Proportion having and source of off-the-farm employment

County and State	Percentage of total number having off-farm work	Percentage (having off-farm work)					deriv. wrk. from var. sources		1/
		WPA	NYA	and sawmill	Lumber and	Mining	day work	Miscellaneous	
Laurens, Ga.	66	30.3	6.0	3.0	-	-	66.7	6.0	
Oglethorpe, Ga.	83	40.0	-	11.4	-	-	60.0	8.6	
Knox, Ky.	71	13.3	13.3	6.7	20.0	-	-	40.0	
Beltrami, Minn.	90	55.3	2.6	-	-	-	10.5	28.9	
Grundy, Mo.	42	40.0	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	
Reynolds, Mo.	95	41.5	7.3	26.8	-	-	12.2	14.6	
San Miguel, N. M.	87	50.0	18.8	-	-	-	-	31.3	
Grayson, Va.	83	20.7	3.4	37.9	10.3	-	20.7	10.3	
Thurston, Wash.	77	50.0	-	-	-	-	20.0	30.0	
Mercer, W. Va.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
All counties	81	39.8	7.1	11.0	2.4	-	24.8	19.3	

1/ Families having work in more than one source were included in as many sources as their work was derived from.



Table 14.-Extent of off-the-farm work

County and State	Days work off the farm						
	Total	Percentage having specified number days					
	Average						
	No. of days	Under 25	25-74	75-124	125-174	175-224	225 and over
Laurens, Ga.	67	48.5	21.2	3.0	12.1	9.1	6.1
Oglethorpe, Ga.	99	17.1	25.7	17.1	14.3	20.0	5.7
Knox, Ky.	98	26.7	26.6	20.0	6.7	13.3	6.7
Beltrami, Minn.	143	15.8	13.2	7.9	39.5	10.5	13.1
Grundy, Mo.	171	-	-	40.0	20.0	-	40.0
Reynolds, Mo.	138	9.8	14.6	29.3	26.8	2.4	17.1
San Miguel, N. M.	162	2.1	10.4	25.0	10.4	35.4	16.7
Grayson, Va.	88	6.9	44.8	24.1	13.8	3.4	6.9
Thurston, Wash.	123	10.0	30.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	10.0
Mercer, W. Va.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	121	15.7	20.5	18.5	18.9	14.6	11.8

Table 14a.- Earnings from off-the-farm work

County and State	Total	Percentage earning specified amounts (dollars)							Total
	average								average
	earn-	Under							daily
	ings	50	50-99	100-199	200-299	300-399	400-499	500	wage
	Dollars								Dollars
Laurens, Ga.	50	69.7	12.1	18.2	-	-	-	-	.75
Oglethorpe, Ga.	100	34.3	22.8	28.6	8.6	5.7	-	-	1.00
Knox, Ky.	228	20.0	13.3	13.3	13.3	26.7	6.7	6.7	2.33
Beltrami, Minn.	410	13.1	2.6	15.8	7.9	5.3	7.9	47.4	2.85
Grundy, Mo.	311	-	-	20.0	-	60.0	20.0	-	1.82
Reynolds, Mo.	273	12.2	9.8	9.7	31.7	19.5	12.2	4.9	1.97
San Miguel, N. M.	352	2.1	8.5	21.3	19.1	8.5	14.9	25.5	2.13
Grayson, Va.	141	20.7	20.7	37.9	6.9	10.3	-	3.4	1.61
Thurston, Wash.	374	-	11.1	11.1	-	11.1	22.2	44.5	2.73
Mercer, W. Va.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	242	21.8	11.9	20.2	12.7	10.7	7.5	15.1	1.98

Table 15.- Average amount of relief received and distribution in relation to kind

County and State	: Average	: Percentage distribution of :			
	: total	: total relief in relation to-:			
	: relief	:	:	:	: Percent
	: received	: Direct	:	:	: receiving
	: per family	: relief	: WPA	: Other	: no relief
	: <u>Dollars</u>				
Laurens, Ga.	: NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oglethorpe, Ga.	: NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Knox, Ky.	: 73	-	78.3	21.7	73.2
Beltrami, Minn.	: 234	6.7	91.3	2.0	37.0
Grundy, Mo.	: 59	-	65.2	34.2	81.3
Reynolds, Mo.	: 135	.9	92.4	6.7	51.2
San Miguel, N. M.	: 210	3.2	93.6	3.2	34.5
Grayson, Va.	: 37	-	80.2	19.8	75.0
Thurston, Wash.	: 198	-	68.5	31.5	37.5
Mercer, W. Va.	: 100	3.5	88.9	7.6	56.4
Orange, Vt.	: NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	: 128	3.0	87.1	9.9	56.2

Table 16. - Expenditures - Distribution and relation to certain items

County and State	: Percentage distribution of total : Percentage distribution of total										
	: expenditure by groups					: expenditures in relation to: --					
	Average	:	:	:	:	500	Family:	FSA and:	All other		
	: expenditure: Under :	:	:	:	:	300 -: and : opera-: opera-: Capital: corp.: paid on	:	:	:	:	
: per family : 100 :100-199:200-299: 499	: over :	:	:	:	:	tion :	tion :	goods :	loans :	debts	
: Dollars											
Laurens, Ga.	158	12.5	70.8	12.5	4.2	-	36.2	60.1	2.7	-	1.0
Oglethorpe, Ga.	111	45.7	47.8	6.5	-	-	34.1	65.9	-	-	-
Knox, Ky.	329	-	12.7	43.6	32.7	10.9	18.6	59.2	5.3	5.3	11.6
Beltrami, Minn.	593	2.3	7.0	9.3	23.3	58.1	15.4	49.7	17.2	-	17.7
Grundy, Mo.	326	-	12.5	25.0	50.0	12.5	16.5	80.6	-	-	2.9
Reynolds, Mo.	367	2.3	7.0	27.9	41.9	20.9	8.3	67.7	6.0	-	18.0
San Miguel, N. M.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grayson, Va.	211	-	50.0	41.7	8.3	-	30.0	56.6	.5	-	12.9
Thurston, Wash.	860	-	-	-	18.8	81.2	27.7	43.7	11.3	2.3	15.0
Mercer, W. Va.	416	-	17.5	27.5	30.0	25.0	9.9	54.6	18.1	1.8	15.6
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	336	8.7	28.3	23.0	20.9	19.1	18.8	56.4	9.7	1.6	13.5



Table 17. - Percentage reporting certain condition for specified parts of the house

County and State	Roof			Floors			Walls			Foundation			Screens			Steps		
	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor	Good:Fair:Poor		
Laurens, Ga. 1/	23	51	25	21	66	13	19	72	9	24	67	9	3	16	-	33	46	21
Oglethorpe, Ga. 2/	25	46	29	15	60	25	13	58	29	13	63	24	3	7	-	10	55	34
Knox, Ky. 3/	40	35	25	-	65	35	30	35	35	25	25	50	19	6	19	17	11	72
Beltrami, Minn. 4/	49	22	29	34	34	32	28	40	33	30	2	10	50	24	26	42	21	16
Grundy, Mo.	44	33	22	40	60	-	20	80	-	57	28	14	50	50	-	50	50	-
Reynolds, Mo.	32	34	34	22	59	20	10	68	23	15	58	28	46	39	14	13	51	36
San Miguel, N. M. 5/	8	58	34	34	6	25	32	66	2	36	62	2	6	10	38	15	31	54
Grayson, Va. 6/	36	23	36	36	47	17	32	51	17	34	54	12	10	10	6	33	33	33
Thurston, Wash. 7/	22	33	44	22	44	33	22	33	44	28	28	43	14	14	-	37	25	37
Mercer, W. Va.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties 8/	33	37	30	23	55	22	20	57	23	27	51	22	22	18	10	28	40	32
1/	81 percent without screens.																	
2/	90 percent without screens.																	
3/	56 percent without screens.																	
4/	58 percent without screens and 21 percent without steps.																	
5/	46 percent without screens.																	
6/	74 percent without screens.																	
7/	71 percent without screens.																	
8/	50 percent without screens.																	

Table 18. - Average family size and average number of rooms and rooms per person and percentage of families having specified space

County and State	Average number in family	Average number of rooms	Average number of rooms per person	Percentage having specified rooms							Percentage of houses having closets
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7 and over	
Laurens, Ga.	5.9	3.8	.7	-	6	30	43	19	2	-	13
Oglethorpe, Ga.	5.6	4.0	.7	-	4	32	40	6	13	4	6
Knox, Ky.	5.8	3.6	.6	5	15	20	40	20	-	-	26
Beltrami, Minn.	5.2	3.3	.4	15	22	29	10	17	2	5	52
Grundy, Mo.	3.4	4.4	1.3	8	8	8	39	23	-	15	50
Reynolds, Mo.	5.4	3.4	.6	-	27	24	32	15	2	-	31
San Miguel, N. M.	5.1	3.2	.6	6	11	57	19	4	-	4	2
Grayson, Va.	5.4	4.2	.7	-	6	21	38	18	15	3	40
Thurston, Wash.	3.0	3.2	1.0	-	33	22	33	11	-	-	27
Mercer, W. Va.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	5.3	3.6	.7	4	13	31	31	13	5	3	23

Table 19. - Relation of size of family to number of rooms per house based on 305 NCF families 1/

Family size number of occupants	House size, number of rooms										Total families in each size
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	and over			
1 or 2	4	9	15	5	4	0	1				38
3	2	3	15	13	6	2	0				41
4	0	8	13	15	4	2	3				45
5	3	4	19	18	9	0	1				54
6	2	6	8	16	3	6	0				41
7	0	5	6	4	6	1	0				22
8	0	3	7	15	4	1	2				32
9 or more	0	2	12	9	5	2	2				32
Total houses each size	11	40	95	95	41	14	9				305

1/ The line through the table designates three groups of houses; figures appearing to the left indicate overcrowded houses having one-half or less room per person, figures enclosed show rooms with less than one person, and figures to the right indicate sufficient room, usually 1 room per person.



Table 20.—Sleeping space—average number of bedrooms and percentage falling below certain requirements

County and State	Percentage having —			
	: Average	: number of	: Less than	:
	: number	: persons	: three-fifths	:
	: of rooms	: per	: sleeping	: Inadequate
	: used for	: sleeping	: room per	: sleeping
	: sleeping	: room	: person	: space 1/
Laurens, Ga.	2.1	2.8	70	46
Oglethorpe, Ga.	2.0	2.8	63	53
Knox, Ky.	2.0	1.8	75	60
Beltrami, Minn.	1.8	2.8	68	66
Grundy, Mo.	2.2	2.0	42	25
Reynolds, Mo.	1.8	3.0	80	68
San Miguel, N. Mex.	1.9	2.7	51	51
Grayson, Va.	2.2	2.5	64	63
Thurston, Wash.	1.4	2.2	22	30
Mercer, W. Va.	NA	NA	NA	NA
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	1.9	2.7	64	53

1/ Specific measurement for individual families--(a) not more than 2 adults per room, (b) 1 adult and not more than 2 children of the same sex per room, (c) not more than 4 children per room, (d) male and female over 6 years old placed in separate room, (e) 1 child under 6 years old permitted to share a room with not more than 2 female children.

Table 21.— Percentage having specified household facilities

County and State	Heating facilities				Lighting facilities		
	: Kitchen: Heating: Fur: Kerosene: Gasoline:				: lamp : lamp : Electric		
	: Fireplace:	: stove :	: stove :	: ace:	: lamp	: lamp	: Electric
Laurens, Ga.	98.0	2.0	-	-	98.0	2.0	-
Oglethorpe, Ga.	95.8	2.1	-	2.1	97.9	2.1	-
Knox, Ky.	95.0	-	5.0	-	100.0	-	-
Beltrami, Minn.	-	7.0	86.0	7.0	83.7	11.6	4.7
Grundy, Mo.	-	-	93.3	6.7	93.3	-	6.7
Reynolds, Mo.	4.5	2.3	93.2	-	97.7	-	2.3
San Miguel, N. Mex.	42.3	5.8	51.9	-	98.2	-	1.8
Grayson, Va.	11.4	2.9	85.7	-	97.0	3.0	-
Thurston, Wash.	-	56.3	43.7	-	43.8	12.5	43.7
Mercer, W. Va.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	44.0	5.9	48.6	1.5	93.2	3.1	3.7

Table 22. - Percentage reporting certain water and sanitation facilities

County and State	Water source										Sanitation			
	Spring	Open	Hand pump	Hand pump	Hand pump	Hand pump	Hand pump	Hand pump	Hand pump	Hand pump	Well or spring	Unimproved	Sanitary	No toilet
Laurens, Ga.	2.0	98.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	58.0	6.0	36.0	-
Oglethorpe, Ga.	47.9	45.8	2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.2	68.7	31.3	-	-
Knox, Ky.	4.8	23.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	71.4	31.6	-	68.4	-
Beltrami, Minn. 1/	4.8	7.1	52.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.5	88.1	2.4	9.5	-
Grundy, Mo.	-	6.7	66.6	13.3	-	-	-	-	-	6.7	93.3	6.7	-	-
Reynolds, Mo.	11.4	79.5	6.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.3	40.9	6.8	52.3	-
San Miguel, N.M. 2/	1.8	27.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	92.6	5.6	1.8	-
Grayson, Va.	88.9	11.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22.9	51.4	25.7	-
Thurston, Wash. 3/	6.2	18.7	43.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	40.0	-	-
Mercer, W. Va.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties 4/	20.2	41.9	13.1	.6	-	-	-	-	-	2.4	63.4	15.5	21.1	-

1/ 16.7 none - 4.8 other.

2/ 70.9 irrigation ditch.

3/ 6.3 none - 6.3 elec.

4/ 2.4 none - .9 other.

Table 23.- Bedding facilities in relation to family size

Family size	Number of beds							7 and over	Total number of families in each group
	1	2	3	4	5	6			
1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
2	7	22	3	1	2	0	0	0	35
3	4	22	9	4	0	0	0	0	39
4	1	24	17	2	0	0	0	0	44
5	2	13	25	11	2	0	0	0	53
6	2	9	14	9	5	1	1	1	41
7	0	0	15	7	1	0	0	0	23
8	0	5	10	16	1	0	1	1	33
9	0	0	4	7	4	0	0	0	16
10 and over	0	0	3	6	4	3	0	0	16
Total beds in each group	19	96	100	63	20	4	2	2	304

Table 24.- Relation of number beds to number mattresses

Number of beds	Number of mattresses								Total No. of beds in each group
	None	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 & over	
1	0	12	4	1	0	1	0	0	18
2	2	8	47	25	11	2	2	1	98
3	4	8	13	38	18	9	7	2	99
4	4	3	3	8	24	9	5	8	64
5	1	0	1	2	5	7	1	2	19
6	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4
7 and over	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Total mattresses in each group	11	32	69	74	59	29	16	15	305



Table 25.- Percentage having certain household equipment and other conveniences

County and State	: :Sewing :machine	: :Washing :machine	: :Icebox :or re- :frigerator	: :Pressure :cooker	: :Radio	: :Telephone
Laurens, Ga.	: 72.0	-	-	-	12.0	-
Oglethorpe, Ga.	: 64.6	-	2.1	2.1	4.2	-
Knox, Ky.	: 66.7	9.5	4.8	-	9.5	-
Beltrami, Minn.	: 79.1	58.1	18.6	9.3	69.8	39.5
Grundy, Mo.	: 68.8	18.8	6.3	12.5	50.0	6.3
Reynolds, Mo.	: 68.2	-	4.5	-	25.0	-
San Miguel, N. M.	: 72.7	-	1.8	14.5	5.5	-
Grayson, Va.	: 75.0	5.6	-	-	27.8	11.1
Thurston, Wash.	: 81.3	68.8	12.5	31.3	68.8	-
Mercer, W. Va.	: NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Orange, Vt.	: NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	: 71.7	13.1	4.9	6.1	25.2	6.7

Table 26. -- Percentage reporting illness - proportionate cost and most frequent causes

County and State	Percentage : reporting : of : illness : indebtedness : during past: attributed to:			Three most frequent causes of illness		
	: 2 years	: medical bills:	: 1	:	: 2	:
Laurens, Ga.	78	31.5	Flu and clds	Malaria	Female	
Oglethorpe, Ga.	23	11.4	NA	NA	NA	
Knox, Ky.	30	.5	Malaria	Flu and pneumonia	Appendix operations	
Beltrami, Minn.	29	3.7	Pneumonia	Appendix operations	Goiter	
Grundy, Mo.	38	12.0	Tonsillitis	Kidney	Appendix operations	
Reynolds, Mo.	70	14.4	Malaria	Colitis	High blood pressure	
San Miguel, N. M.	42	NA	Colds	Kidney	Nervous attacks	
Grayson, Va.	29	4.2	Measles	Foot operation		
Thurston, Wash.	67	.8	Colds	Rheumatism	Measles	
Mercer, W. Va.	56	9.1	High blood pressure	Kidney	Appendix operations	
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
All counties	46	5.4	Colds	Kidney	Appendix operations	

Table 27. - Percentage having certain health impairments in Laurens and Oglethorpe Counties in Georgia

County and State	Percentage having specified impairments														: %
	: Total :	: no. of: Defec-:	: : : Hook-: Pella-:	: : : Her-: Malar-:	: Syph-: High :	: : : Anem-:	: Reprs: Dis :	: : : of : eas :	: Other: diet	: : : ia : peri-:	: : : : de-:	: : : : neum :	: : : : ton :	: : : :fects:	: : : :sils:
Laurnes, Ga. :	288	76	18	26	5	3	3	1	2	8	12	92	49	56	66
Oglethorpe, Ga. :	277	70	25	-	-	6	5	-	6	13	3	81	50	60	63

\* Medical reports on other counties not available.



Table 28.- The average number of months certain home-produced foods were used and the percentage using insufficient amounts of milk and eggs

County and State	Average number of months specified home-produced foods were used during last 12 months												Percent using 1/
	Fats	Lean	meats	Dried	Tomatoes	Leafy,	Other	beans	and	green	vegetable	quate	
Laurens, Ga.	2	4	4	11	1	4	1	1	3	NA	3	NA	NA
Oglethorpe, Ga.	7	8	8	10	1	7	3	1	6	NA	6	NA	NA
Knox, Ky.	9	10	10	8	4	8	11	11	9	84.2	9	84.2	86.7
Beltrami, Minn.	9	5	5	5	2	6	6	2	8	53.8	8	53.8	35.0
Grundy, Mo.	6	7	7	7	6	8	5	5	8	60.0	8	60.0	75.0
Reynolds, Mo.	5	6	6	6	3	6	5	5	5	NA	5	NA	NA
San Miguel, N.M.	6	3	3	4	1	2	1	1	-	NA	-	NA	NA
Grayson, Va.	11	8	8	9	7	7	9	7	8	63.6	8	63.6	66.7
Thurston, Wash.	10	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	8	15.4	8	15.4	75.0
Mercer, W. Va.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	7	3	6	9	2	5	4	5	5	55.4	5	55.4	67.7

1/ Inadequate - according to standards set by supervisors.

Table 29.- The extent to which certain foods were stored

County and State	Fats and butter (lbs.) :Aver. : %	Smoked or : frozen meats (lbs.) :Aver. : %	Eggs (doz.) : (lb.) :Aver. : %	Dried beans, squash, etc. (lb.) :Aver. : %	Potatoes (bu.) :Aver. : %	Cereals (lbs.) :Aver. : %	Fruit (lbs.) :Aver. : %	Syrup, honey, sor.(gal.) :Aver. : %								
	number:stor- : per : ing	number:stor- : per : ing	number:stor- : per : ing	number:stor- : per : ing	number:stor- : per : ing	number:stor- : per : ing	number:stor- : per : none	number:stor- : per : none								
	family:none	family:none	family:none	family:none	family:none	family:none	family:none	family:none								
Laurens, Ga.	: 103	40.0	-	100.0	38	60.0	8	42.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	13	36.0		
Oglethorpe, Ga.	: 137	33.3	-	100.0	56	64.6	12	20.8	327	56.3	42	93.8	9	58.3		
Knox, Ky.	: 250	9.5	163	14.3	58	33.3	24	9.5	109	9.5	10	95.2	2	85.7		
Beltrami, Minn.	: 52	58.1	27	88.4	42	44.2	40	30.2	1	87.5	-	100.0	-	100.0		
Grundy, Mo.	: 16	69.2	15	84.6	34	30.8	16	15.4	21	69.2	31	69.2	5	53.8		
Reynolds, Mo.	: 25	81.8	24	88.6	26	59.1	14	29.5	115	68.2	-	100.0	6	70.5		
San Miguel, N.M.	: 2	94.5	1	98.2	12	92.7	-	100.0	1	96.4	9	92.7	1	98.2		
Grayson, Va.	: 181	19.4	63	66.7	18	61.1	9	11.1	156	44.4	375	66.7	2	83.3		
Thurston, Wash.	: 48	40.0	101	46.7	122	26.7	13	40.0	1	93.3	233	46.7	-	100.0		
Mercer, W. Va.	: NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Orange, Vt.	: NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
All counties	: 86	53.2	30	84.3	5	94.1	38	59.7	14	38.8	89	74.8	62	90.2	5	75.1

1/ Less than one

Table 30.--Average amount and distribution of home-canned food and the average cash spent for food and distribution by groups

County and State	:Average :number :of quarts :per family	:Percentage distribution of :canned foods by groups (gts.)					:Average :Percentage distribution of food cost :cash :by groups				
		: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	
		:25-74	:75-99	:100-389	:over:	:50	:50-99	:100-199	:200		
		Dollars									
Laurens, Ga.	49	38.0	40.0	6.0	16.0	-	84	19.5	50.0	28.3	2.2
Oglethorpe, Ga.	43	35.4	47.9	10.4	6.3	-	66	38.6	40.9	15.9	4.6
Knox, Ky.	224	-	9.5	4.8	66.7	19.0	113	-	50.0	38.9	11.1
Beltrami, Minn.	190	11.9	9.5	4.8	64.3	9.5	180	-	25.0	42.5	32.5
Grundy, Mo.	220	-	7.7	7.7	76.9	7.7	80	-	75.0	25.0	-
Reynolds, Mo.	144	6.8	31.8	9.1	47.7	4.6	162	8.0	12.0	40.0	40.0
San Miguel, N.M.	33	85.4	3.6	-	5.5	5.5	212	2.9	20.6	32.4	44.1
Grayson, Va.	216	-	5.6	8.3	77.8	8.3	49	50.0	50.0	-	-
Thurston, Wash.	262	12.5	-	6.2	50.0	31.3	222	-	-	27.3	72.7
Mertzer, W. Va.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	124	28.6	20.9	6.2	37.5	6.8	127	16.7	34.6	28.0	20.7





Table 32.- Percentage of NCF families participating in programs of various agencies during any part of period 1933-38

County and State	No. of families	Percentage who participated in designated agencies																Percentage	
		Religious	Agri-culture	RR	Relief	Youth agencies	Business and educational	Vocational	Cooperative	Living	Any	Any	Any	Any	Any	Any	Any	who did not participate	Percentage
Laurens, Ga.	50	56.3	88.0	66.0	-	20.0	-	4.0	-	2.0	-	-	-	6.0	12.0	-	-	-	-
Oglethorpe, Ga.	48	76.2	81.3	-	-	29.2	-	2.1	-	-	-	-	-	10.4	18.8	-	-	-	-
Knox, Ky.	21	67.4	9.5	71.4	4.8	14.3	4.8	-	-	-	-	-	38.1	-	14.3	-	-	-	-
Beltrami, Minn.	43	43.8	51.2	62.8	2.3	11.6	11.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.6	-	-	-	-
Grundy, Mo.	16	88.6	12.5	6.3	12.5	-	18.8	12.5	4.7	4.7	14.0	16.3	2.3	60.5	56.3	-	-	-	-
Reynolds, Mo.	44	80.0	31.8	-	18.2	15.9	63.6	63.6	4.5	27.3	2.3	-	-	13.6	45.5	-	-	-	-
San Miguel, N.M.	55	38.9	7.3	3.6	14.5	3.6	47.3	78.2	1.8	14.5	-	3.6	7.3	-	63.6	-	-	-	-
Grayson, Va.	36	12.5	22.2	22.2	11.1	-	27.8	2.8	5.6	5.6	-	-	-	19.4	44.4	-	-	-	-
Thurston, Wash.	16	NA	12.5	-	43.8	43.8	31.3	-	6.3	-	25.0	-	-	6.3	18.8	-	-	-	-
Mercer, W. Va.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-	-	-	-
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-	-	-	-
All counties	329	54.1	41.6	26.1	9.4	6.4	37.1	31.6	3.0	9.1	3.0	1.5	3.3	11.9	3	9.7	-	6.7	32.2

Table 33.- Elective or appointive positions held during year 1938 by members  
of the non-commercial farm families

County and State	Percentage that held positions in														
	Public					Private									
	One or more : positions in holding	One or more : private	One or more : public	One or more : town	One or more : school	One or more : church	One or more : soc.	One or more : lodge	One or more : organ.	One or more : op.	One or more : ens	One or more : 4-H	One or more : club	One or more : 4-H	One or more : club
Laurens, Ba.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oglethorpe, Ga.	18.8	4.2	14.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Knox, Ky.	9.5	-	9.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Beltrami, Minn.	9.3	2.3	7.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grundy, Mo.	25.0	-	25.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reynolds, Mo.	25.0	9.1	15.9	2.3	9.1	18.8	9.1	12.5	2.3	2.3	6.3	7.0	4.5	-	-
San Miguel, N.M.	18.0	18.2	-	1.8	5.5	10.9	1.8	10.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grayson, Va.	22.2	2.8	19.4	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thurston, Wash.	18.8	6.3	12.5	-	6.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mercer, W. Va.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Orange, Vt.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All counties	15.5	5.8	9.7	.9	3.3	.3	1.8	6.7	1.2	-	.6	.3	-	.6	2.1

1/ Irrigation Ditch Commission.



**Table 1. Summary of results**

Run	Time	Distance	Speed	Altitude	Temperature	Humidity	Wind	Clouds	Visibility	Remarks
1	0.5	1.0	2.0	100	20	50	10	10	10	Start of run
2	1.0	2.0	4.0	200	25	60	20	20	20	Continuing run
3	1.5	3.0	6.0	300	30	70	30	30	30	Continuing run
4	2.0	4.0	8.0	400	35	80	40	40	40	Continuing run
5	2.5	5.0	10.0	500	40	90	50	50	50	Continuing run
6	3.0	6.0	12.0	600	45	100	60	60	60	Continuing run
7	3.5	7.0	14.0	700	50	110	70	70	70	Continuing run
8	4.0	8.0	16.0	800	55	120	80	80	80	Continuing run
9	4.5	9.0	18.0	900	60	130	90	90	90	Continuing run
10	5.0	10.0	20.0	1000	65	140	100	100	100	End of run

Notes: 1. All measurements were taken at the same time and place. 2. The altitude was measured by a barometer. 3. The temperature was measured by a thermometer. 4. The humidity was measured by a hygrometer. 5. The wind was measured by an anemometer. 6. The clouds were measured by a cloud counter. 7. The visibility was measured by a visibility meter. 8. The remarks were taken from the log book.



